

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-3, 5-17, 19-20 and 22-49 remain pending. Claims 1, 17, 34, 35, 38, and 41 are independent.

INTERVIEW CONDUCTED

Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting an interview with Applicants' representative on September 9, 2005.

§ 102 REJECTION – YAMAUCHI

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-13, 15, 17-20, 22-23, 26-30, 32, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Yamauchi et al. (USPN 6,020,982).

Independent claim 1 is amended to recite the features of “preset instruction that reflects a user’s medium selection trait” and “wherein said selected medium wearable unit writes the data to the respective loaded memory medium.” At the interview, the Examiner agreed that such features distinguish claim 1 from Yamauchi.

Independent claim 17 is amended to recite the features of “preset instruction that reflects a user’s medium selection trait” and “controlling said

selected medium wearable unit to write the data to the respective loaded memory medium.” At the interview, the Examiner agreed that such features distinguish claim 17 from Yamauchi.

Independent claim 34 is amended to recite the features of “preset instruction that reflects a user’s medium selection trait” and “wherein said selected medium wearable unit writes the data to the respective loaded memory medium.” At the interview, the Examiner agreed that such features distinguish claim 34 from Yamauchi.

Claims 2-3, 5-6, 9-13, 15, 19-20, 22-23, 26-30, and 32 depend from claims 1 or 17 directly or independently. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated with respect to claims 1 and 17, these dependent claims are also distinguishable from Yamauchi.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-13, 15, 17-20, 22-23, 26-30, 32, and 34 based on Yamauchi be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION – YAMAUCHI, AKAMINE, MURATA, WAKUI,

Claims 7-8 and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yamauchi in view of Akamine et al. (USPN Re. 36,589); claims 14 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yamauchi in view of Murata et al. (USPN 5,627,587);

and claims 16 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yamauchi in view of Wakui (USPN 5,986,700).

Claims 7-8, 14, 16, 24-25, 31 and 33 depend from independent claims 1 or 17 directly or indirectly. It has been shown above that independent claims 1 and 17 are distinguishable over Yamauchi. None of Akamine, Murata and Wakui has been, and indeed cannot be, relied upon to correct for at least the above-noted deficiencies of Yamauchi. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 17 are distinguishable over the combination of Yamauchi and any of Akamine, Murata and Wakui.

For at least due to the dependency thereon, claims 7-8, 14, 16, 24-25, 31 and 33 are also distinguishable over the same references. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 7-8, 14, 16, 24-25, 31 and 33 based on Yamauchi, Akamine, Murata and Wakui be withdrawn.

§ 102 REJECTION – SUGA

Claims 35-40, 47 and 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Suga et al. (USPN 6,449,426).

Independent claim 35 is amended to recite the features of “preset instruction that reflects a user’s medium selection trait” and “wherein said selected medium wearable unit writes the data to the respective loaded memory

medium.” At the interview, the Examiner agreed that such features distinguish claim 35 from Suga.

Independent claim 38 is amended to recite the features of “preset instruction that reflects a user’s medium selection trait” and “recording the data to a memory medium loaded in the selected medium wearable unit.” At the interview, the Examiner agreed that such features distinguish claim 38 from Suga.

Claims 36-37, 39-40 and 47-48 depend from independent claims 35 or 38. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated with respect to the independent claims, these dependent claims are also distinguishable over Suga.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 35-40, 47 and 48 based on Suga be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION – SUGA

Claims 41-43 and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Suga. *See Final Office Action, page 15, item 6.* Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claim 41 is amended to recite the features of “preset instruction that reflects a user’s medium selection trait” and “recording the data to a memory medium loaded in the selected medium wearable unit.” At

the interview, the Examiner agreed that such features distinguish claim 41 from Suga.

For at least due to the dependency thereon claim 41, claims 42, 43 and 49 are also distinguishable over Suga.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 41-43 and 49 based on Suga be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Hyung Sohn (Reg. No. 44,346), to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

U.S. Application No. 09/757,471

Docket No. 3562-0112P

Art Unit: 2615

Page 20 of 20

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, POLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By: 

Michael K. Mutter
Reg. No. 29,680

HNS
MKM/HNS

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000